

WAGNER BLECHER LLP
123 Westridge Drive
Watsonville, CA 95076
(408) 377-0500

PATENT APPLICATION

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. MOMI-015

IN THE
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Inventor(s): Hank RISAN et al.

Confirmation No.: 3341

Application No.: 10/771,809

Examiner: Moran, Randal D.

Filing Date: 02/03/2004

Group Art Unit: 2131

Title: METHOD AND SYSTEM FOR SELECTIVELY CONTROLLING ACCESS TO PROTECTED MEDIA ON A MEDIA STORAGE DEVICE

Mail Stop Appeal Brief-Patents
Commissioner For Patents
PO Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

TRANSMITTAL OF APPEAL BRIEF

Transmitted herewith is the Appeal Brief in this application with respect to the Notice of Appeal filed on 05/01/2009.

The fee for filing this Appeal Brief is (37 CFR 1.17(c)) \$540.00.

(complete (a) or (b) as applicable)

The proceedings herein are for a patent application and the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a) apply.

☐ (a) Applicant petitions for an extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136 (fees: 37 CFR 1.17(a)-(d)) for the total number of months checked below:

☐ 1st Month
\$130

☐ 2nd Month
\$490

☐ 3rd Month
\$1110

☐ 4th Month
\$1730

☐ The extension fee has already been filed in this application.

☒ (b) Applicant believes that no extension of time is required. However, this conditional petition is being made to provide for the possibility that applicant has inadvertently overlooked the need for a petition and fee for extension of time.

Please charge Dep. Acct. 50-4157 the sum of \$ 540 . At any time during the pendency of this application, please charge any fees required or credit any over payment to Deposit Account 50-4157 pursuant to 37 CFR 1.25. Additionally please charge any fees to Deposit Account 50-4157 under 37 CFR 1.16 through 1.21 inclusive, and any other sections in Title 37 of the Code of Federal Regulations that may regulate fees. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

☐ I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to:
Commissioner for Patents, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
Date of Deposit:

OR

☒ I hereby certify that this paper is being transmitted to the Patent and Trademark Office facsimile number (571)273-8300 or via electronic transmission.
Date of facsimile/transmission: 07/01/2009
Typed Name: Brenda Dinapoli
Signature: /Brenda Dinapoli/

Respectfully submitted,
Hank RISAN et al.

By /John P. Wagner, Jr./

John P. Wagner, Jr.

Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)

Reg No. : 35,398

Date : 07/01/2009

Telephone : 408-377-0500

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

Appellant:	Hank Risan	Patent Application
Application No.:	10/771,809	Group Art Unit: 2435
Filed:	February 3, 2004	Examiner: Moran, R.
For:	METHOD AND SYSTEM FOR SELECTIVELY CONTROLLING ACCESS TO PROTECTED MEDIA ON A MEDIA STORAGE DEVICE	

APPEAL BRIEF

Table of Contents

	<u>Page</u>
Real Party in Interest	1
Related Appeals and Interferences	2
Status of Claims	3
Status of Amendments	4
Summary of Claimed Subject Matter	5
Grounds of Rejection to Be Reviewed on Appeal	7
Argument	8
Conclusion	15
Appendix - Clean Copy of Claims on Appeal	16
Appendix – Evidence Appendix	24
Appendix – Related Proceedings Appendix	25

I. Real Party in Interest

The assignee of the present patent application is Music Public Broadcasting Inc. 55 River Street, Suite 200 Santa Cruz, California 95060.

II. Related Appeals and Interferences

There are no related appeals or interferences known to the Appellants.

III. Status of Claims

Claims 1-44 are pending in the present application. Claims 1-44 are rejected. This Appeal involves Claims 1-44.

IV. Status of Amendments

All proposed amendments have been entered. An amendment subsequent to the Final Action has not been filed.

V. Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

With respect to Claim 1, an embodiment of a “method for selectively controlling access to media disposed on a media storage device” is shown at least at Figures 4 and 12.

In one embodiment, comprising installing compliance mechanism 300 on computer system 210, compliance mechanism 300 communicatively coupled with computer system 210 when installed thereon, compliance mechanism 300 for enforcing compliance with a usage restriction applicable to said media is shown at least at Figure 4 and described at least at page 33, lines 6-11 of the Specification.

In addition, an embodiment of obtaining control of a data pathway operable on computer system 210, accessing data disposed on media storage device 999 to determine said usage restriction, and selectively preventing computer system 210 from digitally accessing said media via said data pathway while enabling presentation of the media is shown at least at Figure 12 and described at least at page 94, at least at lines 6-11 of the Specification.

With respect to Claim 6, an embodiment of the method as recited in Claim 1 is further described. As described at least in Figure 1 and at least at page 17 lines 22-25 of the Specification, the media is presented using an analog sound rendering device 111 communicatively coupled with said device drive 109 via an analog signal path 112.

With respect to Claim 16, an embodiment of a “system for selectively controlling access to media on a media storage device” is shown at least at Figure 12.

In one embodiment, as shown at least at Figure 12 and described at least at page 91, lines 25-27; and page 92, lines 1-3 of the Specification, said system comprising compliance mechanism 300 disposed on media storage device 999 and configured to be installed on and communicatively coupled with computer system 210, compliance mechanism 300 for enforcing compliance with a usage restriction applicable to said media.

In addition, as shown at least at Figure 12 and described at least at page 92, lines 18-26 of the Specification, an embodiment of device drive 1212 coupled with computer system 210 for accessing media storage device 999, wherein device drive 1212 communicatively coupled with an analog sound rendering device of computer system 210.

Further, compliance mechanism 300 is configured to selectively prevent access to said media via a digital data pathway of computer system 210 while presenting said media via said analog sound rendering device.

With respect to Claim 31, an embodiment of a “computer readable medium for storing computer implementable instructions for causing a computer system to perform a method of selectively controlling access to media on a media storage device” is shown at least at Figure 11 and 12.

In one embodiment, as shown at least at Figure 11, and described at least at page 95, lines 19-23 of the Specification, said method comprising invoking an autorun protocol disposed on media storage device 999 in response to a device drive 1212 coupled with computer system 210 receiving media storage device 999, as well as said autorun protocol for installing compliance mechanism 300 on computer system 210.

In addition, installing compliance mechanism 300 on computer system 210, said compliance mechanism 300 communicatively coupled with computer system 210 when installed thereon, compliance mechanism 300 for providing compliance with a usage restriction associated with said media.

In another embodiment, as shown at least at Figure 12 and described at least at page 93, lines 12-16 of the Specification, acquiring control of a digital data pathway of computer system 210 with a filter driver 1208 coupled with compliance mechanism 300 and with computer system 210, said filter driver 1208 installed during said installing of compliance mechanism 300. In addition, as shown at least at Figure 12 and described at least at page 93, lines 18-22, selectively restricting said media on media storage device 999 from being accessed via said digital data pathway while enabling presentation of said media using an analog sound rendering device communicatively coupled with device drive 1212.

VI. Grounds of Rejection to Be Reviewed on Appeal

1. Claims 1, 5, 14, 16, 21, 31, 37 and 43-44 are provisionally rejected on the grounds of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 9, 12-13, 15, 17, 19 and 22 of copending Application No. 10/772025.

2. Claims 1-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Doherty et al. (U.S. 6,920,567), hereinafter “Doherty”.

VII. Argument

1. Whether Claims 1, 5, 14, 16, 21, 31, 37 and 43-44 are provisionally rejected on the grounds of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 9, 12-13, 15, 17, 19 and 22 of copending Application No. 10/772025.

Claims 1, 5, 14, 16, 21, 31, 37 and 43-44 were provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as allegedly being obvious over claims 1, 9, 12-13, 15, 17, 19 and 22 of U.S. Application No. 10/772,025. See Office Action at page 2. Appellants respectfully requests that these provisional rejections be held in abeyance until all other substantive issues in this case have been resolved. The filing of a terminal disclaimer in this case will not constitute an admission of the propriety of the provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection. See MPEP § 804.02 and *Quad Environmental Technologies Corp. v. Union Sanitary District*, 946 F.2d 870, 20 USPQ2d 1392 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

2. Whether Claims 1-44 are anticipated by Aiello under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

Appellants have reviewed the above cited reference and respectfully submit that the embodiments of the present invention as recited in Claims 1-44 are not anticipated by Aiello for the following rationale.

Appellants respectfully state that Claim 1 (and similarly Claims 16 and 31) include the feature “A method for selectively controlling access to media disposed on a media storage device, said method comprising:

installing a compliance mechanism on a computer system, said compliance mechanism communicatively coupled with said computer system when installed thereon, said compliance mechanism for enforcing compliance with a usage restriction applicable to said media;

obtaining control of a data pathway operable on said computer system;

accessing data disposed on said media storage device to determine said usage restriction; and

selectively preventing said computer system from digitally accessing said media via said data pathway while **enabling** presentation of the media.” (Emphasis added)

According to the Federal Circuit, “[a]nticipation requires the disclosure in a single prior art reference of each claim under consideration” (W.L. Gore & Assocs. v. Garlock Inc., 721 F.2d 1540, 220 USPQ 303, 313 (Fed. Cir. 1983)).

Moreover, in order to establish anticipation under 35 U.S.C. § 102 the cited art must not only disclose all elements of the claim, but must also disclose those elements “arranged as in the claim.” Connell v. Sears, Roebuck & Co., 722 F.2d 1542, 1548 (Fed. Cir. 1983).

Appellants respectfully disagree with the Examiner that Doherty et al. anticipates the claimed features and discloses all the elements arranged as in the Claims.

That is, Appellants have reviewed Doherty et al. and do not understand Doherty et al. to anticipate obtaining control of a data pathway operable on said computer system;
accessing data disposed on said media storage device to determine said usage restriction;

and selectively preventing said computer system from digitally accessing said media via said data pathway while enabling presentation of the media.

For this reason, Appellants respectfully submit Doherty et al. does not disclose all of the claimed features within the four corners of the document. As such, Appellants respectfully submit that since Doherty et al. does not disclose all of the Claimed features **and also** all of the Claimed features arranged or combined in the same way as recited in Claims 1, 16 and 31, it cannot be said to prove prior invention of the thing claimed and, thus, cannot anticipate under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

With respect to Claims 2-15, Appellants respectfully state that Claims 2-15 depend from the allowable Independent Claim 1 and recite further features of the present claimed invention. With respect to Claims 17-30, Appellants respectfully point out that Claims 17-30 depend from the allowable Independent Claim 16 and recite further features of the present claimed invention. With respect to Claims 32-44, Appellants respectfully point out that Claims 32-44 depend from the allowable Independent Claim 31 and recite further features of the present claimed invention. Therefore, Appellants respectfully state that Claims 2-15, 17-30 and 32-44 are also allowable as pending from allowable base Claims.

Claim 6

Appellants respectfully state that Claim 6 includes the feature, “presenting said media using an analog sound rendering device communicatively coupled with said device drive via an analog signal path.” (Emphasis added)

Appellants respectfully disagree with the Examiner that Doherty et al. teaches presenting said media using an analog sound rendering device communicatively coupled with said device drive via an analog signal path.

Appellants have reviewed Doherty et al. including the column and lines provided in the Office Action and do not understand Doherty et al. to teach or anticipate presenting said media using an analog sound rendering device communicatively coupled with said device drive via an analog signal path (emphasis added).

For this additional reason, Appellants respectfully submit Doherty et al. does not disclose all of the claimed features within the four corners of the document. As such, Appellants respectfully submit that since Doherty et al. does not disclose all of the Claimed features **and also** all of the Claimed features arranged or combined in the same way as recited in Claim 6, it cannot be said to prove prior invention of the thing claimed and, thus, cannot anticipate under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

Claims 16-44

Appellants respectfully submit that Claim 16 (and similarly Claim 31) includes the feature “selectively restricting said media on said media storage device from being accessed via said digital data pathway while enabling presentation of said media using an analog sound rendering device communicatively coupled with said device drive.” (Emphasis added).

According to the Federal Circuit, “[a]nticipation requires the disclosure in a single prior art reference of each claim under consideration” (W.L. Gore & Assocs. v. Garlock Inc., 721 F.2d 1540, 220 USPQ 303, 313 (Fed. Cir. 1983)).

Appellants respectfully disagree with the Examiner that Doherty et al. teaches selectively restricting said media on said media storage device from being accessed via said digital data pathway while enabling presentation of said media using an analog sound rendering device communicatively coupled with said device drive.

Appellants have reviewed Doherty et al. including the column and lines provided in the Office Action and do not understand Doherty et al. to teach or anticipate selectively **restricting said media** on said media storage device from **being accessed via said digital data pathway** while **enabling presentation of said media** using an **analog sound rendering device** communicatively coupled with said **device drive** (emphasis added).

For this additional reason, Appellants respectfully submit Doherty et al. does not disclose all of the claimed features within the four corners of the document. As such, Appellants respectfully submit that since Doherty et al. does not disclose all of the Claimed features **and also** all of the Claimed features arranged or combined in the same way as

recited in Claims 16 and 31, it cannot be said to prove prior invention of the thing claimed and, thus, cannot anticipate under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

With respect to Claims 17-30, Appellants respectfully point out that Claims 17-30 depend from the allowable Independent Claim 16 and recite further features of the present claimed invention. With respect to Claims 32-44, Appellants respectfully point out that Claims 32-44 depend from the allowable Independent Claim 31 and recite further features of the present claimed invention. Therefore, Appellants respectfully state that Claims 17-30 and 32-44 are also allowable as pending from allowable base Claims.

Response to Arguments

On page 8 of the Final Office Action dated 3/4/2009, the Office Action submits “Applicant’s arguments do not comply with 37 CFR 1.111(c) because they do not clearly point out the patentable novelty which he or she thinks the claims present in view of the state of the art disclosed by the references cited or the objections made.”

Appellants respectfully disagree. Specifically, Appellants point out that in the very next paragraph the Office Action cites the Appellants previous response including at least one portion of Appellants argument pointing out the patentable novelty which he or she thinks the claims present in view of the state of the art disclosed by the references cited or the objections made.

As such, it appears to Appellant that the Office Action improperly applied 37 CFR 1.111(c) during examination and as such failed to properly review and address the Appellants appropriate and legitimate points of novelty as argued. For this reason, Appellants respectfully request the board reverse the rejection of record as it appears the Office Action improperly applied 37 CFR 1.111(c) during examination.

In addition, on page 9 of the Final Office Action dated 3/4/2009, the Office Action submits a follow on argument “Doherty teaches accessing the user system to obtain system information identifying the user. The transmission of data to and from separate devices requires control of a data pathway.”

Appellants respectfully submit that controlling a data pathway between separate devices to obtain system information identifying the user, does not anticipate any portion of the claimed features.

Specifically, Appellants respectfully submit anticipation requires the disclosure in a single prior art reference of each claim under consideration. However, Appellants further submit “controlling a data pathway between separate devices to obtain system information identifying the user” does not anticipate the claimed features, “obtaining control of a data pathway operable on said computer system; accessing data disposed on said media storage device to determine said usage restriction; and selectively preventing said computer system from digitally accessing said media via said data pathway while enabling presentation of the media.” (Emphasis added)

In contrast, Appellants respectfully submit that the description of Doherty in the present Office Action clearly shows that Doherty does not anticipate the claimed features. E.g., “Doherty teaches accessing the user system to obtain system information identifying the user. The transmission of data to and from separate devices requires control of a data pathway.” (emphasis added)

For this reason, Appellants respectfully request the board reverse the rejection of record as it appears the Office Action’s rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) is improper.

Further, Appellants respectfully contend the additional arguments provided on page 10 and 11 of the Present Final Office Action continue to improperly correlate the delivery and control of products teachings of Doherty as anticipating the claimed features. That is, Appellants do not understand the Present Office Action to utilize any teachings of Doherty to anticipate the features, “obtaining control of a data pathway operable on said computer system; accessing data disposed on said media storage device to determine said usage restriction; and selectively preventing said computer system from digitally accessing said media via said data pathway while enabling presentation of the media.” (Emphasis added)

For this additional reason, Appellants respectfully request the board reverse the rejection of record as it appears the Office Action's rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) is improper.

Conclusion

Appellants believe that pending Claims 1-44 are patentable over the cited art.
Appellants respectfully request that the rejection of Claims 1-44 be reversed.

The Appellants wish to encourage the Examiner or a member of the Board of Patent Appeals to telephone the Appellants' undersigned representative if it is felt that a telephone conference could expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,
WAGNER BLECHER LLP

Dated: July 1, 2009

/John P. Wagner, Jr./

John P. Wagner, Jr.
Registration No.: 35,398

WAGNER BLECHER LLP
Westridge Business Park
123 Westridge Drive
Watsonville, CA 95076

Phone: (408) 377-0500
Facsimile: (831) 722-2350

VIII. Appendix - Clean Copy of Claims on Appeal

1. A method for selectively controlling access to media disposed on a media storage device, said method comprising:

installing a compliance mechanism on a computer system, said compliance mechanism communicatively coupled with said computer system when installed thereon, said compliance mechanism for enforcing compliance with a usage restriction applicable to said media;

obtaining control of a data pathway operable on said computer system;

accessing data disposed on said media storage device to determine said usage restriction; and

selectively preventing said computer system from digitally accessing said media via said data pathway while enabling presentation of the media.

2. The method as recited in Claim 1 wherein said usage restriction comprises a copyright restriction or a licensing agreement associated with said media.

3. The method as recited in Claim 1 further comprising:

installing a filter driver on said computer system, said filter driver configured to be coupled with and operable in conjunction with said compliance mechanism and for controlling said data pathway.

4. The method as recited in Claim 3 wherein said filter driver prevents digitally accessing said media.

5. The method as recited in Claim 1 further comprising:

activating an autorun mechanism disposed on said media storage device in response to a device drive coupled with said computer system receiving said media storage device, said autorun mechanism for initiating said installing said compliance mechanism on said computer system.

6. The method as recited in Claim 1 further comprising:

presenting said media using an analog sound rendering device communicatively coupled with said device drive via an analog signal path.

7. The method as recited in Claim 5 wherein said autorun mechanism is activated in response to detection of a usage restriction indicator disposed on said media storage device, subsequent to said device drive receiving said media storage device.

8. The method as recited in Claim 5 wherein said autorun mechanism is activated in response to detection of a selection of an icon representing said media.

9. The method as recited in Claim 1 further comprising:

bypassing said installing said compliance mechanism on said computer system if an instance of said compliance mechanism is predisposed on said computer system.

10. The method as recited in Claim 1 further comprising:

initiating a communication session between said computer system and a network to which said computer system is coupled and from which said compliance mechanism is available;

comparing said compliance mechanism present on said computer system and said compliance mechanism available from said network; and

updating said compliance mechanism on said computer system.

11. The method as recited in Claim 1 further comprising:

deactivating said compliance mechanism upon detection of uncoupling of said media storage device from said computer system.

12. The method as recited in Claim 1 further comprising:

uninstalling said compliance mechanism upon detection of uncoupling of said media storage device from said computer system.

13. The method as recited in Claim 1 wherein said media storage device upon which said media is disposed is from a group of media storage devices consisting of a compact disk (CD), a mini CD, a digital versatile disk (DVD), a mini DVD, a compact flash card, a secure

digital (SD) card, a memory stick, a digital audio tape (DAT), a digital video tape (DVT), a holographic storage object, a magneto-optical disk, a multi-layer fluorescent disk, an optical disk, and a magnetic disk.

14. The method as recited in Claim 1 further comprising:
installing a media identification mechanism on said computer system;
utilizing said media identification mechanism to identify an instance of media disposed on said media storage device;
determining a usage restriction applicable to said instance of media; and
using said compliance mechanism to selectively control digitally accessing said instance of media based upon said determining.

15. The method as recited in Claim 14 further comprising:
activating an autorun mechanism disposed on said media storage device in response to a device drive coupled with said computer system receiving said media storage device, said autorun mechanism for initiating installing said media identification mechanism on said computer system.

16. A system for selectively controlling access to media on a media storage device, said system comprising:
a compliance mechanism disposed on said media storage device and configured to be installed on and communicatively coupled with a computer system, said compliance mechanism for enforcing compliance with a usage restriction applicable to said media;
a device drive coupled with said computer system for accessing said media storage device, said device drive communicatively coupled with an analog sound rendering device of said computer system; and
wherein said compliance mechanism is configured to selectively prevent access to said media via a digital data pathway of said computer system while presenting said media via said analog sound rendering device.

17. The system of Claim 16 wherein said compliance mechanism further comprises a filter driver configured to be coupled with said compliance mechanism and said digital data pathway, said filter driver for controlling said digital data pathway.

18. The system of Claim 16 wherein said compliance mechanism is configured to initiate a communication session between said computer system and a network to which said computer system is coupled and from which a second compliance mechanism is available.

19. The system of Claim 18 wherein said compliance mechanism is configured to compare said compliance mechanism on said computer system with said second compliance mechanism and to update said compliance mechanism on said computer system.

20. The system of Claim 16 further comprising:
an autorun protocol disposed on said media storage device configured to initiate installation of said compliance mechanism and a presentation mechanism on said computer system in response to said device drive receiving said media storage device.

21. The system of Claim 20 wherein said autorun protocol is configured to initiate installation of said compliance mechanism in response to detection of a usage restriction indicator disposed on said media storage device subsequent to said device drive receiving said media storage device.

22. The system of Claim 20 wherein said autorun protocol is configured to initiate installation of said compliance mechanism in response to detection of a selection of an icon representing said media.

23. The system of Claim 20 wherein said autorun protocol is configured to bypass said installation upon detection of an instance of said compliance mechanism present on said computer system.

24. The system of Claim 20 wherein said presentation mechanism is configured to present said media in accordance with said compliance mechanism.

25. The system of Claim 16 wherein said usage restriction comprises a copyright restriction or licensing agreement applicable to said media.

26. The system of Claim 16 wherein said compliance mechanism is configured to be deactivated upon detection of uncoupling of said media storage device from said computer system.

27. The system of Claim 16 wherein said compliance mechanism is configured to be uninstalled upon detection of uncoupling of said media storage device from said computer system.

28. The system of Claim 16 wherein said media storage device upon which said media is disposed is from a group of media storage devices, said group consisting of a compact disk (CD), a mini CD, a digital versatile disk (DVD), a mini DVD, a compact flash card, a secure digital (SD) card, a memory stick, a digital audio tape (DAT), a digital video tape (DVT), a holographic storage object, a magneto-optical disk, a multi-layer fluorescent disk, an optical disk, and a magnetic disk.

29. The method as recited in Claim 14 further comprising:
a media identification mechanism installed on said computer system and communicatively coupled with said usage compliance mechanism, said media identification mechanism for identifying an instance of media disposed on said media storage device to determine said usage restriction applicable to said instance of media.

30. The method as recited in Claim 29 further comprising:
an autorun protocol disposed on said media storage device configured to initiate installation of said media identification mechanism on said computer system in response to said device drive receiving said media storage device.

31. A computer readable medium for storing computer implementable instructions for causing a computer system to perform a method of selectively controlling access to media on a media storage device, said method comprising:

invoking an autorun protocol disposed on said media storage device in response to a device drive coupled with said computer system receiving said media storage device, said autorun protocol for installing a compliance mechanism on said computer system;

installing said compliance mechanism on said computer system, said compliance mechanism communicatively coupled with said computer system when installed thereon, said compliance mechanism for providing compliance with a usage restriction associated with said media;

acquiring control of a digital data pathway of said computer system with a filter driver coupled with said compliance mechanism and with said computer system, said filter driver installed during said installing of said compliance mechanism; and

selectively restricting said media on said media storage device from being accessed via said digital data pathway while enabling presentation of said media using an analog sound rendering device communicatively coupled with said device drive.

32. The computer readable medium of Claim 31 wherein said method further comprises:

bypassing said installing said compliance mechanism on said computer system if a copy of said compliance mechanism is predisposed thereon.

33. The computer readable medium of Claim 31 wherein said method further comprises:

commencing a communication session between said computer system and a network to which said computer system is coupled and from which a version of said compliance mechanism is available.

34. The computer readable medium of Claim 33 wherein said method further comprises:

updating said compliance mechanism on said computer system.

35. The computer readable medium of Claim 34 wherein said method further comprises:

activating a presentation mechanism coupled with said computer system for presenting said media, said presentation mechanism authorized to present said media in accordance with said compliance mechanism.

36. The computer readable medium of Claim 34 wherein said method further comprises:

installing a presentation mechanism on said computer system to enable said computer system to present said media, said presentation mechanism authorized to present said media in accordance with said compliance mechanism.

37. The computer readable medium of Claim 31 wherein said autorun protocol is invoked in response to detection of a usage restriction indicator disposed on said media storage device, subsequent to said device drive receiving said media storage device.

38. The computer readable medium of Claim 31 wherein said autorun protocol is invoked in response to detection of a selection of an icon representing said media.

39. The computer readable medium of Claim 31 wherein said usage restriction comprises a copyright restriction or licensing agreement applicable to said media.

40. The computer readable medium of Claim 31 wherein said method further comprises:

deactivating said compliance mechanism upon detection of uncoupling of said media storage device from said device drive.

41. The computer readable medium of Claim 41 wherein said method further comprises:

uninstalling said compliance mechanism upon detection of uncoupling of said media storage device from said device drive.

42. The computer readable medium of Claim 31 wherein said media storage device upon which said media is disposed is from a group of media storage devices, said group consisting of a compact disk (CD), a mini CD, a digital versatile disk (DVD), a mini DVD, a compact flash card, a secure digital (SD) card, a memory stick, a digital audio tape (DAT), a digital video tape (DVT), a holographic storage object, a magneto-optical disk, a multi-layer fluorescent disk, an optical disk, and a magnetic disk.

43. The computer readable medium of Claim 31 wherein said method further comprises:

- installing a media identification mechanism on said computer system;
- utilizing said media identification mechanism to identify an instance of media disposed on said media storage device;
- determining a usage restriction applicable to said instance of media; and
- using said compliance mechanism to selectively control digitally accessing said instance of media based upon said determining.

44. The computer readable medium of Claim 43 wherein said method further comprises:

- activating said autorun protocol disposed on said media storage device in response to said device drive receiving said media storage device, said autorun mechanism for initiating installing said media identification mechanism on said computer system.

IX. Evidence Appendix

No evidence is herein appended.

X. Related Proceedings Appendix

No related proceedings are herein appended.